

Community-Based Research in Graduate Education: Implementing Program Decisions Across the Disciplines

Karen I. Case
University of Hartford

Community-Based Research (CBR) has been recognized as a significant reform agent within graduate education. This article explores the decisions involved in implementing a CBR model into graduate education programs. It uses the doctoral program in educational leadership at the University of Hartford as an example of how CBR can be employed to support the development of leadership, collaborative, and research competencies for graduate students, particularly in the area of school practice. The article concludes by highlighting particular decision points and recommendations for graduate faculty and community members to consider for assuring equitable partnerships in CBR.

Policy makers have long bemoaned the state of graduate education in the United States, recommending approaches that might enhance program quality and relevance across the disciplines. More specifically, concerns have been raised regarding the capacity of graduate education to equip students to broadly “address societal needs” (Austin, 2010, p. 92-93). O’Meara and Jaeger (2006) argue that “when graduate education is isolated from the world, it is impoverished,” maintaining that incorporating community-based research (CBR) into graduate programming “offers opportunities for students to more effectively acquire research and teaching skills, to learn the knowledge of their discipline in ways that promote deeper understanding and greater complexity, and to make connections with public agencies and groups that enrich the quality of their education” (p. 4). Indeed, graduate education represents an important dimension for postsecondary institutions interested in becoming engaged campuses (Beere, Votruba, & Wells, 2011). Ironically, despite the fact that university and community research partnerships are burgeoning throughout higher education, the bridging of doctoral research to community needs and stakeholders has yet to be fully realized or articulated (Ward, 2010, p. 65).

Although curricular movements to integrate service-learning and civic engagement exist at the undergraduate and graduate level, doctoral reform often fails to consider community-based learning and research (Weerts & Sandmann, 2010, p. 632). An engaged university campus strives to fulfill the civic mission of educating students to become democratic citizens and seeks to address the needs of the surrounding local, national and global communities at all levels of education. According to Weerts and Sandmann (2010), “service and outreach are typically conceived as one-way approaches to delivering knowledge and service to the public, whereas engagement

emphasizes a two-way approach in which institutions and community partners collaborate to develop and apply knowledge to address societal needs” (p. 702).

Consonant with Boyer’s (1990; 1996) vision of higher education reform, CBR is a form of engaged scholarship that involves research efforts that are jointly planned, implemented, and evaluated by university researchers and community partners. The resulting scholarship is intended to benefit the entire community: external partners, institutions, faculty members, their disciplines, and students (Ward, p. 59, 2010). CBR envisions universities “as portals to the larger society through which faculty and students can become engaged in local efforts to solve community problems” (Fogel & Cook, 2006, p. 595). Bogotch and Schoorman (2009) are among many advocates calling for this kind of graduate research grounded in community work that prepares “engaged public intellectuals” (p. 302). This level of engagement has the promise of revitalizing doctoral education just as it has undergraduate teaching and learning.

CBR within doctoral programs can be conceptualized as a form of experiential education in which faculty and students jointly engage with community groups to conduct studies that meet local needs (Qualters, 2010, p. 6). Referred to variably as action research, community-based participatory research, and translational research, CBR acts as a conceptual umbrella for a variety of research methodologies available for addressing multifaceted social problems in disciplines as diverse as health, education, environmental studies, and social sciences. Historically rooted in critical praxis, CBR acts to “empower different groups to collaborate in research in order to appreciate and address complex, social, cultural, political and structural factors impacting on the lives of individuals and their communities” (Liamputpong, 2010, p. 187). By firmly situating “the ivory tower within the community” (Baumann, Domenech Rodriguez, & Parra-Cardona, 2011, p. 146), CBR aids in facilitating discourse that crosses disciplinary and institutional borders (Sandlin, Schultz, & Burdick, 2009, p. 3). Called “one of the most exciting ventures in contemporary higher education” (Dallimore, Rochefort, & Simonelli, p. 2010, p. 15), CBR represents “a commitment to build on community strengths and resources, to foster co-learning and capacity building, and to balance research and action for mutual benefit of all partners” (Israel et al., 2010, p. 2094). Many university administrators have highlighted community engagement as an institutional priority for their faculty (Weerts & Sandmann, 2010, p. 632), and CBR in graduate programs in particular has been underscored as one means for creating engaged scholars (O’Meara & Jaeger 2006; Ward, 2010). However, recommendations regarding how to implement a CBR model into graduate programming have not been fully articulated.

Work to date has considered community engagement as a vehicle to diversify graduate student career options via skills learned for nonacademic work (Day, Becerra, Ruiz, & Powe, 2012) and as a method of social-

izing early-career faculty for increased community engagement (O'Meara, 2007). The impact of CBR on advisor-student interaction in doctoral degree programs has also been measured (Jaeger, Sandmann, & Kim, 2011). Researchers have investigated the value of CBR in graduate nursing education (Narsavage, Batchelor, Lindell, & Chen, 2003) and in public and community mental health courses (Calhoun, McElligott, Weist, & Raczyński, 2012; Delphin & Rowe, 2008). According to O'Meara and Jaegar (2006), "public health and medical programs are far ahead of many other disciplines in having established permanent long-term partnerships between graduate programs" and community partners (p. 18). They attribute this curricular requirement to the pressing need for community involvement in health related concerns. Other fields, such as physical therapy (Furze, Black, Peck, & Jensen, 2011), clinical psychology (Chu, Emmons, Wong, Goldblum, Reiser et al., 2012) and social work (Bledsoe-Mansori, Bellamy, Wilke, Graddy, Dinatta et al., 2013; Fisher & Corciullo, 2011, Martin & Pyles, 2013), have institutionalized many tenets of CBR into the graduate curriculum.

Burgeoning certificate and doctoral programs such as the Community-based Public Health Certificate Program at Johns Hopkins and the Ph.D. in Community Research and Action at Vanderbilt, Peabody College, have recognized CBR as a method that combines content and procedurally based competencies for graduate students who seek the dual role of researcher and activist. CBR can facilitate graduate students' ability to look beyond institutional and professional boundaries and develop an appreciation for the relationships that exist between their academic disciplines and the community.

Graduate programs that employ a CBR approach promote knowledge application (Beckman, Brandenberger, Shappell, 2009) and have been shown to instill cultural competence (Alegria, 2009), cultural humility (Ross, 2010), and leadership (Franz, 2013; Varga, Arauza, Folsom, del Rosario Luna, Gutierrez et al., 2010). In the United Kingdom, researchers O'Connor, Lynch, and Owen (2011) observed that CBR developed "graduate attributes in areas of citizenship, employability, resilience, problem solving and motivation" (p. 113). Community engaged competencies for faculty as well as graduate students include understanding the literature of CBR, finding, developing and sustaining partnerships, research, funding CBR initiatives, and disseminating CBR products (Hamel-Lambert, Millesen, Slováková, & Harter, 2012).

Adoption of CBR as a graduate program model represents a move from a unidirectional, "old-school pedagogical methodology" (Liese, 2009, p. 79) to one that stresses reciprocity and mutuality between student and advisor (Jaeger, Sandmann, & Kim, 2011). It takes faculty member and student "outside themselves" (Liese, 2009, p. 79) into collaborative relationships based on solving real-world community problems. Peterson (2009), citing Boyte and Farr (1997), suggests that "engagement in the community enhances cognitive development and provides a fundamental shift 'from knowledge as self-interest and private good... to knowledge as civic respon-

sibility and public work”” (p. 543). For graduate students, CBR narrows the gap between academically legitimized knowledge and the informal and organic learning that comes from community involvement and engagement. This kind of learning is particularly relevant for graduate programming in the field of educational leadership in that much of a school leader’s effectiveness comes from jointly working with parents and community members on educational initiatives and to solve problems (Garmston & Von Frank, 2012).

CBR in its truest form requires that students gain self-efficacy as leaders as well as strive to develop the collective efficacy of the community. This leadership moves beyond the charismatic, creating productive tensions and a “delicate balancing act” as doctoral students strive to be researchers and community leaders by investing “in the collective goals and projects of their organizations and in their own personal life projects and ambitions” (Mische, 2001, p. 137). Beyond a contingency or situational approach to leadership, whereby necessary skills and functions fluctuate given varying circumstances and communities, this represents a decentering of leadership, paying attention to collective change as contextual, “place-based, or situated in particular sites and venues” (Holland, Fox, & Daro, 2008, p. 111). Moreover, graduate education at the dissertation level requires that students believe not only in their ability to conduct research with the potential of influencing social change, but also in the potential and power of the community to jointly engage in work that solves a jointly identified research problem or purpose. “In order to work toward change from beyond the personal standpoint, groups of people also must believe in their capacity collectively to influence social change for the common good” (Drechsler & Jones, 2009, p. 409). This form of collective change is what Ganz (2010) describes as social movement that

[emerges] as a result of the efforts of purposeful actors (individuals, organizations) to assert new public values, form new relationships rooted in those values and mobilize the political, economic, and cultural power to translate these value into action... social movement participants make moral claims based on renewed personal identities, collective identities, and public action. (p. 527)

Akin to distributive leadership, educational leaders must display competencies evidencing that they can enter a community; jointly ascertain a research problem evident in the lives of community members; and mobilize community resources by building capacity for collective change. To build this capacity, doctoral students must be able to identify, recruit, and work (Ganz, 2010, p. 528) with community leaders to research sustainable solutions to problems. The student must walk a tightrope that evokes agency – organizing, mobilizing, and driving evidence-supported change- while simultaneously encountering myriad constraints in the form of internal and

external expectations from academic, community constituents. The student must enact this work while also confronting resource limitations in the areas of time, money, and information. Yet, “navigating this tension between agency and constraint – recognizing the limits to their power, while finding a way of taking action – is at the heart of the practice of leadership” (Nohria & Khurana, 2010, p. 21) and, even more so, educational leadership.

Graduate Programs in Educational Leadership

Canole and Young (2013) contend that graduate programs in educational leadership should prepare candidates who have “knowledge about (a) the collection and analysis of evidence pertinent to the district educational environment (b) the use of appropriate strategies to collect, analyze and interpret evidence pertinent to the district environment and (c) how to communicate information about the district to the community” (p. 32-33). These proficiencies are built on an antiquated conception of school leadership, and they fail to consider how CBR can be instilled within the curriculum of educational leadership programs to advance evidence-based practice and increased community involvement.

The predominant underpinnings of most educational leadership programs, however, are the standards set by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), which do make room for community engagement. Standard Four of ISLLC highlights the need for school leaders to participate in community engagement: “A building level education leader must have knowledge of strategies for collaboration with faculty and community members, understanding of diverse community interests and needs, and best practices for mobilizing community research” (Canole & Young, 2013, p. 32). A performance expectation falling under the purview of this standard advises school leaders to partner with institutions of higher education and community groups for the purpose of meeting school goals. This ISSLC standard falls short of recommending research or evidence-based practice conducted jointly with school community members. Preparation programs in educational leadership could adopt CBR as a means of supplying aspiring school leaders with the collaborative and research skills necessary to jointly solve educational problems with community members (Furco, 2013).

This notion is supported by current conceptions of leadership practice. Leadership can be viewed “a relational and collective process” (Presskill & Brookfield, 2009, p.3). No longer consigned to an individualistic model, leadership can be conceptualized as the possession of many individuals who share power and influence within and across communities (Kezar & Carducci, 2009, p. 6). This new form of engagement calls for graduate students in educational leadership to gain an understanding of distributive leadership, best defined as allocating and dispersing leadership work and functions throughout the school community (Louis, Mayrowetz,

Smily, & Murphy, 2009). As distributive leaders within schools, principals must “build trusting relationships with school community members, display a willingness to share leadership and power, and an ability to exit their comfort zone and take risks as they confront politically charged issues” (Cooper, 2010, p. 175). Academic preparation should focus on public relations skills (Moore, 2009), as well as competencies related to collaboration (Orr & Orphanos, 2011), parent and community involvement (Oxley, 2013), and evidenced based practice (Earl & Louis, 2012; Reboore & Walmsley, 2006).

An example of how this can occur can be found within the coursework of the program of study for the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership at the University of Hartford. Course development for the CBR emerged not only from programmatic concerns regarding leadership competencies and research relevancy, but also from a culture and infrastructure that supports CBR. Chartered in 2010, the Institute for Translational Research serves the College of Education, Nursing and Health Professions as “a college-wide umbrella for collaborative research activities by faculty, students, and their community partners” (College of Education, Nursing and Health Profession, University of Hartford, 2010). The overarching mission of the University of Hartford is to be a “private university with a public purpose” (University of Hartford, 2012). The University has an established tradition of involvement in the greater Hartford region and within the Hartford Public Schools in particular.

Building on this history, a CBR course was developed that offers students not only an introduction to the conceptual and methodological foundations of CBR, but also serves to instruct graduate students in the development of a CBR proposal (see Appendix for syllabus). Within this course, students identify community members and determine a researchable problem of interest. Graduate students may continue to build on these projects throughout their doctoral coursework and these collaborations often result in doctoral dissertations. One example of a CBR project that developed across the program into dissertation research can be found in Brase’s (2011) research on homeless and unaccompanied high school-aged youth. Current estimates for unaccompanied youth are underreported, given that these adolescents seek out friends and family members to provide them shelter for variable lengths of time. Brase collaborated with community members comprising individuals who had previously experienced homelessness to examine unaccompanied youths’ reported levels of social support. These community members had faced the stigma of homelessness. They served as recruiters for the study. The responsibility for networking, conducting interviews, data coding, and analysis was shared jointly by the research team. This study contributed to building individual and community capacity to understand the problem and to school-based recommendations regarding how social supports structures and teacher professional development on homeless youth could be incorporated into the high school setting.

Such experiences provide graduate students in educational leader-

ship with the opportunity to develop personal narratives that connect and commit them to school-based community action. Effective instructional programming for CBR in educational leadership involves classroom forums and seminars that theoretically anchor school and community-based experiential learning for graduate students. This programming builds upon a curriculum that rigorously analyzes the complexities of collaborative research, while simultaneously stressing the need for school leaders to engage with community members in a continuous relationship-building process that involves assessment of shared values and goals. Engaged research fosters a direct relationship between knowledge production and educational practice and change (Nygreen, 2006). For aspiring school leaders, research platforms such as CBR can contribute to building collaboration and trust between members of the school community, provide evidence-based practices, and set the stage for increased student achievement within schools (Oxley, 2013).

Decisions for Implementing CBR into Graduate Programming

Incorporating CBR into graduate programming requires the dual decision-making of faculty and community members. Implementation considerations are content and procedurally-based, ranging from the consideration of community member involvement in curriculum and research, advisory level, and types of partnerships, to the examination of what constitutes appropriate products, outcome evaluations, and dissemination outlets. Prior to decision-making, department chairs and program directors must consider the readiness of graduate faculty to engage with the community.

Institutional and Programmatic Readiness

Much has been written about challenges concerning campus and faculty readiness for CBR (Nyden, 2003; Sligo & Culligan, 2007). Sibley (2004) cautions that, historically, “the case of research which was really ‘grassroots,’ seriously involving people outside the academy, is likely to be judged unproductive” (p. 56). Citing O’Meara, Kaufman, and Kuntz’s (2003) study on faculty work life, Koliba (2007) suggests that barriers to faculty adoption of CBR include scarce resources, an evolving faculty entrepreneurial role, and heightened expectations for scholarly productivity, teaching, and service (p. 325). Coupled with traditional reward systems tied to promotion and tenure within institutions that may not have fully adopted CBR (Kennedy, Vogel, Goldberg-Freeman, Kass, & Farfel, 2009) – and the increased time commitment that this research entails (Anderson, Cutright, & Anderson, 2013; Biegel, Kola, Meeks, Stevenson, & Beimers, 2010) – graduate program faculty may be reluctant to engage in CBR with graduate students as novice researchers and community members in a co-advising capacity. More familiar with a one-researcher model, graduate faculty may

be opposed to what can seem like murky, decentered roles.

Thus, incorporating CBR into graduate education programs becomes complex given varying faculty motivations (O'Meara, 2008a) and the potentially new roles and relationships occurring between faculty, student, and community members (O'Meara & Jaeger, 2006). This can disrupt the faculty-student relationship during classroom instruction and during advising on research projects or dissertations. Typically research design falls within the purview of advisor and student, who act in conjunction with appointed committee members known for content and methodological expertise. These individuals have been enlisted to ensure the integrity of the research. Evaluation by community members adds a new dimension to the assessment of CBR. Hollander (2011) contends that CBR can be problematic due to the inability to maintain control over the research process. She discusses how this lack of control can occur through such procedural necessities as changing research questions and methods and altering political conditions (p. 265). Other challenges include ensuring students' understanding of the research ethics of CBR (Buchanan, Miller, & Wallerstein, 2007), the difficulties involved in sustaining the motivation of those in the research collective, and the monitoring of action (Israel et al., 2010, p. 2094). Institutional review boards (IRB) unfamiliar with CBR may be unwilling to accept research wherein there is no supervision over community partners (Reid & Brief, 2009; Wolf, 2010).

Safeguarding Research Rigor

Maintaining methodological rigor within the program, and communicating this across the university, represents a significant programmatic challenge. Faculty unfamiliar with CBR can demonstrate reluctance to approving CBR research proposals for thesis and dissertation work. Entrenched attitudes about the rigor of research outside the traditional discovery paradigm has the potential to cause significant hardship and time delays for graduate students, as well as serve to subsequently smother implementation and dissemination efforts. CBR may also fail to be undertaken due to evaluation concerns regarding the norm of assessing individual graduate student research competencies and research-based products.

Developing Relationship-Based Procedures

Implementing CBR into graduate education programs relies on the development of what has been called relationship-based procedures (Calleison, Jordan, & Seifert, 2005). CBR requires complex and time-consuming "processes of building relationships, trust, and division of responsibilities" (Green, Daniel, & Novick, 2001 p. 28). Decision making for CBR requires that faculty identify and approach community partners or community organi-

zations regarding willingness to partner and serve in an educational capacity. Partnerships can be initiated by the community or by the university (Daniels, 2013). Defining and approaching a community may be challenging (Kennedy, Vogel, Goldberg-Freeman, Kass, & Farfel, 2009). Demange, Henry and Preau (2012) classify communities as “natural,” “socially constructed,” or “organized.” Community members may be local to the university setting, internationally based, or loosely organized by interest and networked via social media. Community can “refer to localities or groups that have a common interest or cause despite the lack of a common location” (Green, Daniel, & Novick, 2001, p. 20). Originally conceived by Pretty, Guijt, Thompson and Scoones (1995), Jacobs (2010) identified seven levels of community participation in CBR: no community participation; passive community participation; participation by information; participation by consultation; functional participation; interactive participation; and self-mobilization of the community. Interactive participation by community members is recommended for graduate programs vested in ensuring equity between faculty and community members.

Partner relationships need to take into careful consideration the nuances of communication, ongoing assessment of mutuality in both the process and outcomes of the relationship, as well as the realization that in a working partnership, there will be both interdependency between the partners and, hopefully a transformation from individual to partner-developed goals, expectations and outcomes, (Price, Foreman Kready, Mogul, Cohen-Filipic, & Davey, p. 46).

These authors highlight the importance of communicating the mission, research ethics, roles, resources, timelines, priorities, and the mutual benefits to be derived from the partnership in order to create equitable partnerships. Mutuality and reciprocity represent fundamental underpinnings for engaged partnerships (French, Williams, Tang, Abrams, Townson et al., 2013).

To facilitate equitable partnerships, graduate program faculty should consider forming a participatory research advisory group to guide student engagement in the community as well as to plan, implement, and evaluate CBR projects and research. Graduate programs may require such committees to aid in curriculum decisions and participate directly in CBR. Structures for this advisement can range from establishing community advisory boards (CABS) to hiring community members as clinical faculty to having community members collaborate informally throughout the research process. CABS, in particular, have been reported as a common forum, often-times acting in the capacity of a “sounding board” for researchers (Kennedy, Vogel, Goldberg-Freeman, Kass, & Farfel, 2009, p. 7). Franz (2013) uses the nomenclature of “research stakeholder advisory committee” (RSAC) and

suggests that the group include between three and ten community members and meet regularly.

Additional procedures for graduate faculty who desire to work with community groups on CBR include spending substantial time with partners at the forefront to describe the mission, objectives, planned program of study, and expected outcomes of the graduate program, as well as the mission, goals and objectives of the partnership. Community members' knowledge levels and confidence regarding involvement in the research process should also be assessed. Community members should be asked to share not only research needs, but also examples of previous, ongoing, and upcoming community projects. Graduate faculty and student research should be explained to community members in light of faculty interests and expertise and students' existing and aspirant competencies. Questions regarding levels of student immersion and readiness should also be discussed. If willing, community members can participate in classes at specific points throughout the program, within research-based courses or as occasional guest speakers. Such classroom interactions can also occur prior to or following the completion of the project and, over time, can serve to establish trust and level power dynamics. Timelines can be established to insure continuous engagement in CBR with the awareness that there can be unforeseen consequences stemming from external and internal problems for graduate programs and community partners.

Assessing CBR Products

Graduate faculty and community members must also work closely to develop clear evaluative rubrics for student CBR projects and research in addition to developing the desired outcomes and products stemming from CBR. Limitations of CBR as a methodology should be discussed among faculty members, graduate students, and community members. Potential limitations have been identified as: self-selection bias and bias in recruitment; absence of randomization; and the inclusion of respondents that are highly motivated and thus fail to be representative of the broader population (Viswanathan, Ammerman, Eng, Gartlehner, Lohr et al., 2004). It is important to discuss with community members methods to assess and correct for selection bias when conducting evaluation studies on community-based projects (Hill, Goats, & Rosenman, 2010).

Appropriate and specific evaluation models for the partnership and CBR outcomes represent necessary decision points for graduate faculty. CBR can be collaboratively evaluated according to contextual factors, levels of collaboration, and partnership dynamics. It is also possible to evaluate the extent of community participation in aiding the development of graduate curriculum and research design. Evaluation models should consider impact on the community. The types of CBR products also represent a decision point. Such products might include: (a) student research products taking

the form of theses and dissertations; (b) peer-reviewed products produced by faculty, students, and community members; and (c) dissemination products delivered across the broader community (Calleson, Jordan, & Seifer, 2005).

Collaborative Decision-Making and Graduate CBR Programming

CBR as a form of engaged scholarship is by its nature participative and represents a means of procuring diverse perspectives for the purpose of investigating and solving multifaceted community problems: “By involving others and leveraging their different kinds of knowledge, engaged scholarship can produce knowledge more penetrating and insightful than when scholars or practitioners work on problems alone” (Van de Ven, 2007, p. 9). The implementation of CBR into graduate programming across the disciplines requires that faculty and community members examine specific decision points throughout the related areas of graduate curriculum and research, community advisory level, types of partnerships, appropriate products, and evaluation of outcomes and dissemination outlets. Joint decision-making between graduate program faculty and community members acts not only as a mechanism for collaboration, but also as an avenue to assure equity in CBR.

Conclusion

Timing and faculty enthusiasm impacted the implementation of a stand-alone course in CBR into the curriculum of the doctoral program in Educational Leadership at the University of Hartford. Structurally, university, college, and programmatic readiness were also factors that led to the creation of this CBR course as a core research component of students’ planned program of study. Without administrative and faculty support across the campus, CBR as a curricular component and methodology might have been relegated to a section of an introductory research course; however, as doctoral students began to conduct research pivotal to the communities and organizations in which they worked, the construction and implementation the CBR course took on the mantle of necessity.

When graduate programs create the conditions necessary for curriculum experiences and joint faculty-community guidance in CBR projects and studies, academic institutions will be one step closer to a new vision “where teaching and learning are vigorous and vital, scholarship is valued for its relevance as well as its rigor and the ends of knowledge truly are the benefit and use of life” (Strand et. al., 2003, p. 241). To employ CBR is tantamount to developing a curriculum in context (Cornbleth, 1990). A deep and abiding understanding of the role of community in graduate education is crucial to the mission of developing engaged practitioners and scholars. Employing CBR as a pedagogy and methodology offers graduate programming a chance to adopt a “radically interdisciplinary and contextualized sensibil-

ity toward research...that draws from a wide range of cultural discourses" (Sandlin, Schultz, & Burdick, 2010, p.3) and upholds Dewey's (1916) promise of a democratic curriculum that takes into account "the adaptation of studies to the needs of the existing community life...with the intention of improving the life we live in common so that the future shall be better than the past" (p.125).

References

Alegria, M. (2009). Training for research in mental health and HIV/AIDS among racial and ethnic minority populations: Meeting the needs of new investigator. *American Journal of Public Health, 99*(Suppl 1), S26-S30.

Anderson, B., Cutright, M., & Anderson, S. (2013). Academic involvement in doctoral education: Predictive value of faculty mentorship and intellectual community of doctoral education outcomes. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 8*, 19-201.

Austin, A. E. (2010). Reform efforts in STEM doctoral education: Strengthening preparation for scholarly careers. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education handbook of theory and research* (pp. 90-128). Dordrecht, NY: Springer Science + Business Media.

Baumann, A., Domenech Rodriguez, M., Parra-Crdona, J. R. (2011). Community-based applied research with Latino immigrant families: Informing practice and research to ethical and social justice principles. *Family Process, 50*, 132-148.

Beckman, M., Brandenberger, J.W., Smith Shappell, A. (2009, Fall). Graduate students and community-based learning. *Academic Exchange Quarterly, 13*(3), 45-50.

Beere, C., A., Votruba, J., C., & Wells, G. (2011). *Becoming an engaged campus*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Biegel, D., Kola, L. A., Meeks, D., Stevenson, L., & Beimers, D. (2010). A university-agency mental health research collaboration: A case example. *Care Management Journals, 11*(2), 83-90.

Bledsoe-Mansori, S. E., Bellamy, J. L., Wike, T. Grady, M., Dinata, E., Killian-Farrell, C., & Rosengberg, K. (2013). Agency-university partnerships for evidence-based practice: A national survey of schools of social work. *Social Work Research, 37*(3), 179-193.

Bogotch, I. & Schoorman, D. (2009). Epilogue. In A. K. Tooms & D. Schoorman (Eds.), *Bridge leadership: Connecting education leadership and social justice to improve schools*. (pp. 293-306). Charlotte, N.C.: Information Age Publishing.

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Boyer, E. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach, 1*(1), 11-20.

Buchanan D, Miller F, & Wallerstein N. (2007). Ethical issues in community-based participatory research: Balancing rigorous research with community participation. *Community Intervention Studies Progress in Community Health Partnerships, 1*(2), 153-160.

Burdick, J & Sandlin, J.A. (2009). Educational inquiry and the pedagogical other: On the politics and ethics of research critical pedagogies. In J. A. Sandlin, B.D. Schultz & J. Burdick, J. (Eds.), *Handbook of public pedagogy: Education and learning beyond schooling* (pp. 116-124). New York, NY: Routledge Press.

Brase, M. K. (2011). *Who's there to help? Assessment of social supports received by homeless and unaccompanied youth in high school.* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses (AAT 3454002).

Calhoun, J., McElligott, J., Weist, E., & Raczyński, J. (2012). Core competencies for doctoral education in public health. *American Journal of Public Health, 102*(1), 22-29.

Calleson, D. C., Jordan, C. & Seifer, S. D. (2005). Community-engaged scholarship: Is faculty work in communities a true academic enterprise? *Academic Medicine 80*(4), 317-321.

Canole, M. & Young, M. (2013). *Standards for school leaders: An analysis.* Council of Chief State School Officers: Washington, D. C. Retrieved from <http://www.cesso.org/Documents/Analysis%20of%20Leadership%20Standards-Final-070913-RGB.pdf>

Chu, J. P., Emmons, L., Wong, J., Goldblum, P., Reiser, R., Barrera, A. Z. & Byrd-Olmstead, J. (2012). The public psychology doctoral training model: Training clinical psychologists in community mental health competencies and leadership. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 6*(2), 76-83.

Cooper, C. W. (2010). Educational leaders as cultural workers: Engaging family and school communities through transformative leadership. In S. D. Horsford (Ed.), *New perspectives in educational leadership: Exploring social, political and community context and meaning* (pp. 173-195). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Cornbleth, C. (1990). *Curriculum in context.* New York, NY: Falmer Press.

Dallimore, E. L., Rochefort, D.A., & Simonelli, K. (2010). Community-based learning and research. In D. M. Qualters, (Ed.), *Experiential education: Making the most of learning outside the classroom* (pp. 15-22). New Directions in Higher Education. San Francisco, CA: Wiley.

Daniels, G. (2013). A five step model for "unconventional engagement." *The Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship 6*(1), 39-44.

Delphin, M. E. & Rowe, M. (2008). Continuing education in cultural competence for mental health practitioners. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 39*(2), 182-191.

Demange, E., Henry, E., Preau, M. (2012). *From collaborative research to community based research. A methodological toolkit.* Paris. ANRS/Coalition PLUS. Coll. Sciences soicales et sida.

Day, K., Becerra, V., Ruiz, V. L. & Powe, M. (2012). New ways of learning, knowing, and working: Diversifying graduate student career options through community engagement. In C. Cramer, C. Martin, A. Gilvin & G. Roberts (Eds.), *Engaged scholarship*. (pp.163-182). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Graduate School Press and Imagining America's PAGE Program.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. USA: Macmillan.

Drechsler, M.J. & Jones, W. A. Jr. (2009). Becoming a change agent. In S. R. Komives, & W. Wagner (Eds.), *Leadership for a better world: Understanding the social change model of leadership development* (pp. 397-444). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Earl, L. & Louis, K. S. (2012). Data use: Where to from here? In K. Schildkamp, M. Lin, & L. Earl (Eds.), *Data driven decision making in education: Challenges and opportunities* (pp. 193-204). Dordrecht, NL: Springer.

Fisher, R. & Corciullo, D. (2011). Rebuilding community organizing in social work. *Journal of Community Practice*, 19(4), 335-368.

Fogel, S. & Cook, J. (2006). Considerations on the scholarship of engagement as an area of specialization for faculty. *Journal of social work education*, 42(3), 595-606.

French, C. Williams, J.E., Tang, J. Abrams, E. Townson, L. Sabin, M., Sandmann, L., & Wake, C. (2013). The University of New Hampshire Engaged Scholar Academy: Instilling in faculty the principals of effective partnership. *The Journal of Public Scholarship in Higher Education*, 3, 19-42.

Furco, A. (2013). A research agenda for k-12 school-based service learning: Academic achievement and school success. *International Journal on Service-Learning and Community Engagement*, 1(1), 1-12.

Furze, J., Black, L., Peck, K., & Jensen, G.M. (2011). Students' perceptions of a community engagement experience: Exploration of reflections on social responsibility and professional formation. *Journal of Physiotherapy Theory and Practice*, 27(6), 411-421.

Ganz, M. (2010). Leading change: Leadership, organization, and social movements. In N. Nohria & R. Khurana (Eds.), *Handbook of leadership theory and practice: A Harvard business school centennial colloquium* (pp. 527-568). Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Garmston, R. J. & Von Frank, V. (2012). *Unlocking group potential to improve schools*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.

Green, L., Daniel, M., & Novick, L (2001). Partnerships and coalitions for community-based research. *Public Health Reports*, 1(116), 20-31.

Hamel-Lambert, J. M., Millesen, J. L., Slovak, K., Harter, L. M. (2012). Reflections on community-engaged scholarship faculty development and institutional identity at Ohio University. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 16(1), 129-148.

Hill, L.G., Goats, S. G., Rosenman, R. (2010). Detecting selection effects in community implementations of family-based substance abuse prevention programs. *American Journal of Public Health*, 100(4), 623-630.

Holland, D., Fox, G., & Daro, V. (2008). Social movements and collective identity: a decentered, dialogic view. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 81, 95.

Hollander, J. B. (2011). Keeping control: the paradox of scholarly community-based research in community development. *Community Development Journal*, 42(2), 265-272.

Israel, B. A., Coombe, C. M., Cheezum, R. R., Schulz, A. J. McGranaghan, R. J., Lichtenstein, R., Reyes, A. G., Clement, J., Burris, A., (2010). Community-based participatory research: A capacity-building approach for policy advocacy aimed at eliminating health disparities. *American Journal of Public Health*, 100(11), 2094-2102.

Jacobs, G. (2010). Conflicting demands and the power of defensive routines in participatory action research. *Action Research*, 12(8): 367-386.

Jaeger, A. J., Sandmann, L. R. and Kim, J. (2011). Advising graduate students doing community engaged dissertation research: The advisor-advisee relationship. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 15(4), 5-25.

Kezar, A. & Carducci, R. (2009). Revolutionizing leadership development. In A. Kezar (Ed.). *Rethinking leadership practices in a complex, multicultural and global environment: New concepts and models for higher education* (pp. 1-38). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, Inc.

Koliba, C. J. (2007). Engagement, scholarship and faculty work: Trends and implications for public education. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 13(2), 315-333.

Liamputpong, P. (2010). *Performing qualitative cross-cultural research*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Liese, H. (2009). The civically engaged scholar: identity, relationship, and the RPT process. In M. L. Diener & H. Liese (Eds.), *Finding meaning in civically engaged scholarship: personal journeys* (pp. 77-85). Charlotte, N.C: Information Age Publishing.

Louis, K. S., Mayrowetz, D., Smiley, M. & Murphy, J. (2009). The role of sensemaking and trust in developing distributed leadership. In A. Harris (Ed.), *Distributed leadership: Different perspectives* (pp.157-179). Netherlands: Springer Press.

Martin, E., M. & Pyles, L. (2013). Social work in the engaged university. *Journal of Social Work Education, 49* (4), 635-645.

Mische, A. (2001). Juggling multiple futures: personal and collective project-formation among Brazilian youth leaders. In C. Barker & A. Johnson (Eds.), *Leadership and social movements* (pp. 137-160). Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

Moore, E. H. (2009). *School public relations for student success*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.

Narsavage, G. L., Batchelor, H., Lindell, L. & Chin, Y. J. (2003). Developing personal and community learning in graduate nursing education through community engagement. *Nursing Education Perspectives, 24*(6), 300-305.

Nohria, N. & Khurana, R. (2010). Advancing leadership theory and practice. In N. Nohria & R. Khurana (Eds.). *Handbook of leadership theory and practice: A Harvard business school centennial colloquium* (pp. 3-26). Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Nyden, P. (2003). Academic incentives for faculty participation in community-based participatory research. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 18*(7).

Nygren, K. (2006). Reproducing or challenging power in the questions we ask and the methods we use: A framework for activist research in urban education. *The Urban Review, 38*(1), 1-26.

O'Connor, K. M., Lynch, K., & Owen, D. (2011). Student-community engagement and the development of graduate attributes. *Education & Training, 53*(2), 100-115.

O'Meara, K. & Jaeger, A. (2006). Preparing future faculty for community engagement: Barriers, facilitators, models and recommendation. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 11*(4), 3-26.

O'Meara, K. (2008a). Motivation for faculty community engagement: Learning from exemplars. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 12*(1), 7-29.

O'Meara, K. (2008b). Graduate education and community engagement. In C.L. Colbeck, K. O'Meara, and A. Austin (Eds.), *Educating integrated professionals: Theory and practice on preparation for the professorate*. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, Volume 113. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Orr, M. T. & Orphanos, S. (2011). How graduate-level preparation influences the effectiveness of school leaders: A comparison of the outcomes of exemplary and conventional leadership preparation programs for principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 47*(1), 18-70.

Oxley, D. (2013). Connecting secondary schools to parents and communities. *Principal's Research Review, 8*(1), 1-7.

Peterson, T. H. (2009). Engaged scholarship: reflections and research on the pedagogy of social change. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 14(5), 541-552.

Pretty, J. N., Gujit, I., Thompson, J. & Scoones, (1995). *Participatory learning and action: A trainer's guide*. Retrieved from <http://pubs.iied.org/6021IIED.html>.

Price, S. K., Foreman Kready, S. B., Mogul, M, Cohen-Filipic, K. & Davey, T. L., (2013). Partnership process guidelines: Social work perspectives on creating and sustaining real world university-community partnership. *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship*, 6(1), 45-54.

Presskill, S. & Brookfield S. D. (2009). *Learning as a way of leading: Lessons from the struggle for social justice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Qualters, D. M. (2010). Experiential education: Making the most of learning outside the classroom. *New Directions in Higher Education*. San Francisco, CA: Wiley.

Reid, C., & Brief, E. (2009). Confronting condescending ethics: How community-based research challenges traditional approaches to consent, confidentiality, and capacity. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 7(1-2), 75-85.

Ross, L. (2010). Learning cultural humility. *Journal of Community Practice*, 18 (2/3), 315-335.

Sandlin, J. A. J., Schultz, B. D. & Burdick, J. (2010). Understanding, mapping, and exploring the terrain of public pedagogy. In J.A. Sandlin, B. B. Schultz, & J. Burdick (Eds.) *Handbook of public Pedagogy: Education and learning beyond schooling* (pp. 1-7). New York: NY: Routledge Press.

Strand, K., Marullo, S., Cutforth, N., Stoecker, R. & Donohue, P. (2003). *Community-based research and higher education: Principles and practices*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sibley, D. (2004). Being disengaged. In D. Fuller, D. & R. Kitchen (Eds.), *Radical Theory/Critical praxis: Making a difference beyond the academy*. (pp.52-56). Vernon and Victoria, BC Canada: Praxis (e)Press.

Sligo, F., & Culligan, N. (2007). Defining focus and integrity in building a community research coalition. *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, 20(4), 305-318.

University of Hartford (2012). Hartford, 2012: *A Five-Year Strategic Plan for the University of Hartford*. Retrieved from <http://www.hartford.edu/aboutuofh/files/pdf/strategicplan.pdf>.

University of Hartford, College of Education, Nursing and Health Professions (2010). *Translating between theory and practice*. Retrieved from <http://www.hartford.edu/enhp/itr/>.

Varga, C. M., Arauza, C., Folsom, K., del Rosario Luna, M., Gutierrez, L., Ohliger Frerking, P., Shelton, K., Foreman, C., Waffle, D., Reynolds, R., & Cooper, P. J., (2010). A community engagement process for families with children with disabilities: Lessons in leadership ad policy. *Maternal Child Health Journal*, (16)1, 21-30.

Viswanathan, M., Ammerman, A., Eng, E., Gartlehner, G., Lohr, K.N., Griffith D., Rhodes S., Samuel-Hodge, C., Maty, S., Lux, L., Webb, L., Sutton, S.F., Swinson, T., Jackman, A., & Whitener, L. (August, 2004). *Community-based participatory research: Assessing the evidence*. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.

Van De Ven, A. H. (2007). *Engaged scholarship: A guide for organizational and social researchers*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ward, K. (2010). Doctoral student socialization for service roles. In S. K. Gardner and P. Mendoza (Eds.), *On becoming a scholar: Socialization and development in doctoral education* (pp. 57-76). Sterling VA: Stylus Publishing.

Weerts, D. & Sandmann, L. R. (2010). Community engagement and boundary-spanning roles at research universities. *Journal of Higher Education*, 81(6) 632-657.

Wolf, L. E. (2010). The research ethics committee is not the enemy: Oversight of community-based participatory research. *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics*, 5(4), 77-86.

Appendix: Syllabus for Community-Based Research

Community-based research (CBR) has grown steadily at institutions of higher education. This research orientation represents an attempt by scholars and community members to leverage research skills for a community benefit. Traditionally community members' input and expertise are oftentimes not recognized or solicited during the research process. CBR rests on a very simple premise--communities have a need for high quality research but may lack the skills with which to conduct a research project. That is where higher education can serve. Community partners represent an invaluable resource to any research endeavor. CBR provides a mechanism through which faculty and community members can be partnered to jointly build on each other's capacities for investigation by becoming full partners in jointly conceptualized and conducted scholarship.

This course offers an introduction to the conceptual and methodological underpinnings of community-based research. The overall objective of the course is to teach principles and applied methods of community-based research, while aiding graduate students in the identification of relevant research questions and development of a CBR proposal which they may choose to continue and bring to fruition following the completion of the course.

Recommended Text:

Strand, K. J., Cutforth, N., Stoecker, R., Marullo, S., & Donohue, P. (2003). *Community-based research and higher education: Principles and practices*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Course Objectives:

At the end of the course, students will be able to:

1. Define CBR and community;
2. Reflect on best practice in CBR;
3. Describe the benefits of CBR for community impact, capacity building and ethical considerations;
4. Apply the methods of CBR to an individualized research project;
5. Demonstrate an understanding of CBR in translating research into practice;
6. Learn and apply leadership skills to CBR;
7. Examine appropriate research methods to the principles of CBR.

Assignments

There are six assignments in this class that will result in students being able to complete a CBR research proposal. For these assignments it is recommended that students use a notebook or computer file divided into five subsections. This notebook/file will be reviewed throughout the se-

mester. This notebook is intended to be a “living document” that changes and improves in clarity and depth as the semester progresses. In this way the proposal develops throughout the course of the semester and students gain feedback throughout the course of the semester. Thus, rough drafts are turned in on specified dates and returned with feedback for changes. Consequentially, sections build on each other as the semester progresses. In this way feedback is given throughout the semester and the assignment is completed in a paced and methodical manner. Following the approval of the final proposal, roundtables will be conducted during the last two weeks of class with doctoral students, faculty and community members; and students will report on their proposals for further feedback.

Assignment	Due Date
<p>Section One: Introduction to the CBR proposal</p> <p>The goal of the CBR proposal is significant and a problem vested in the community.</p> <p>Relevant literature that substantiates the significance and provides insights into problem.</p>	<p>Rough Draft</p> <p>Third week of class</p>
<p>Section Two: CBR problem statement</p> <p>The research problem is situated in the community context.</p> <p>In this section there is a clear and researchable purpose statement, as well as specific objectives of the research.</p>	<p>Rough Draft</p> <p>Fifth week of class</p>
<p>Section Three: Theoretical orientation or conceptual framework of the CBR</p> <p>Articulate the theory or concepts from the literature that offer the foundational underpinning to the problem. This section should contain the ideas that guide the CBR</p>	<p>Rough Draft</p> <p>Seventh week of class</p>

Assignment	Due Date
Section Four: Research Question(s) of the CBR Research questions should link to the concepts or theoretical or conceptual framework.	Rough Draft Due Eighth week of class
Section Five: Significance of the CBR Describe the importance of this CBR research to the community and to the research and theoretical literature in the field. Provide answers to the question what will this CBR contribute to addition of public and scholarly knowledge? Will this CBR promote positive social change?	Rough Draft Due Tenth week of class
Final CBR Proposal and Roundtables presented over a two week period	Twelfth – fourteenth week of class

Schedule of Classes

First Class

Introducing CBR.

Second Class

Defining community(ies) for CBR

Third Class

Beginning a CBR and the ethics of a research partnership.

Fourth Class

Co-ascertaining community and academic needs

Fifth Class

Determining strategies of a CBR and considering organizational structures

Sixth Class

Establishing policies and procedures.

Seventh Class

Troubleshooting conflict and power in CBR relationships, the role of leadership.

Eighth Class

Evaluating potential methodologies for the CBR

Ninth Class

Sharing the CBR with partners, community(ies) and within academic venues.

Tenth Class

Sustaining the CBR partnership

Eleventh Class

Navigating CBR and the campus community

Twelfth Class

Linking CBR to the postsecondary curriculum and instruction.

Thirteenth Class

Reviewing CBR for Criteria and evidence.

Fourteenth Class

Presenting CBR proposals at roundtable.

Author

Karen I. Case, Ph.D. is Associate Professor of Educational Leadership in the College of Education, Nursing and Health Professions at the University of Hartford. Case teaches a range of courses within the doctoral program in educational leadership, including: Community Based Research, Seminar in Instructional Development, and Leadership Theory. She also supervises doctoral dissertations. Case's primary research interest is focused on creating instructional modifications for marginalized learners. She is also interested in levels of community participation in dissertation research and community partnerships in K-20 education reform initiatives.